

DC. That is because money spent through the Federal budget does less economic good—in other words, it turns over less times for the economy—than money spent by individual taxpayers and working men and women of America. All one has to do is look at the defense budget. The defense budget produces a lot of expensive items. But once they are made, those items are not used for producing wealth. They serve a good purpose for our national defense. But they don't turn over any more money in our economy.

We come to these risky spending schemes of this administration with 77 new programs, and we have tax cuts before Congress. Being at the highest level of taxation in the history of our country, at about 21 percent of gross domestic product, if we allow the President, through those 77 risky spending schemes, to build up to that level of expenditure at 21 percent, then when we have a downturn in the economy, the spending is going to stay up here and the income is down here. Then you have another budget deficit; whereas, if we continue the pattern of the last 50 years of taxing at about 18.5 to 19 percent of the gross domestic product, then over the historical average there will be less chance of a deficit.

We want to let the working men and women keep more of their money and keep our historical level of taxation at about 18.5 to 19 percent. We do not want the extra money that is now coming into the Treasury to be eaten up by these 77 risky spending schemes of this administration.

I feel compelled to correct a statement made by my democratic colleague from Illinois. My colleague stated that the Republican marriage penalty bill would require 5 million more taxpayers to pay higher taxes. My colleague stated:

Here's the kicker. They don't want to talk about they have drawn their bill up so that five million Americans will actually pay higher taxes. . . . Take a look around the corner—five million Americans end up paying higher taxes under the alternative minimum tax. So now isn't that something?

This is simply incorrect. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation there would be no increase in any taxpayer's overall tax liability as a result of this bill.

In fact, the bill attempts to correct an AMT problem for millions of taxpayers. According to Joint Tax, in the year 2010, 9.2 million tax returns will benefit from the AMT provision in the bill—this includes 6.5 million joint returns and 2.7 million other individual returns benefiting from this bill. This is a worthy goal, and we should do what is right.

According to Joint Tax, in 2010 approximately 1.5 million joint returns benefiting from the AMT credit extension will become AMT payers under the bill. However, as I just mentioned, Joint Tax estimates that the bill would not increase any taxpayer's overall tax liability.

The record must be set straight—no one will pay higher taxes as a result of this bill.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have rejected a request we made yesterday to allow a debate solely on the marriage tax penalty relief. The Senate leader has offered 10 relevant amendments, including their alternative marriage tax penalty proposal. The other side has rejected this offer. The other side claims they want to debate other issues—talk about issues other than tax relief.

Either way you slice it—by what the Senate minority has done or by what they claim—they evidently don't care about marriage tax penalty relief itself.

Senate Democrats could live with a focused debate when it applied to the education savings accounts a month ago, March 2, and ending the Social Security earnings limit for seniors over 65, which only a few weeks ago, on March 22, was passed by the Senate.

However, now when it comes down to marriage tax penalty relief, our colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle say no. Why? What has changed compared to these other two tax bills? Why were those other items only a few weeks ago so much more important than this bill that would help over 40 million families? The bill before the Senate will help 40 million families. They want to debate other issues, so they are holding up the marriage tax penalty bill.

Imagine the hue and cry Democrats would raise if the shoe were on the other foot—if we were debating these other issues and we demanded to offer marriage tax penalty amendments.

The House has acted. The Finance Committee has acted. The Senate should now act. However, it can't because the Democrats are obstructing this legislation like in-laws on a honeymoon.

We have been more than fair. We have said this is a debate on marriage tax penalty relief—offer any amendment you want that related to this bill and we will give you a debate and a vote on it. Any amendment—up to ten of them.

How many relevant amendments did the Democrats offer yesterday? Less than half of their ten addressed this issue. By my generous calculation that means that they only half care about marriage tax penalty relief.

In the House, it was not this way. Forty-eight Democrats across the Rotunda voted for marriage tax penalty relief. It was bipartisan over there. Why can't it be bipartisan here? Democrats here are seeking to make this a highly partisan Senate.

So the Senate must wait and over 40 million American families will have to wait. Every couple who suffers under this marriage tax penalty, which has existed for 31 years, must wait further. In a sense, everyone is going to have to wait while the other side of the aisle obstructs this tax relief effort.

This is tax week across America. America's families are hunkered down over their kitchen tables figuring out their tax forms. Isn't it time these taxpayers get a break from the most unfair part of this process, the provisions that tax them at a higher rate just because they are doing what is right and are married?

I want to give them that break. My colleagues want to give them that break. However, my Democrat colleagues don't want to give them that break. In fact, they don't want to even give them a debate or a vote on this very important issue.

I urge the Senate to go to the final debate on this and pass it before we adjourn this week. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

TAXES

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, as I listened to my colleague, I thought some things said required a response.

As we look back at how we achieved balance in our budget and how we turned massive deficits into massive surpluses, let me explain how it was done. This chart covers 1980 through 1999. The blue line is the outlays or expenditures of the Federal Government; the red line is the revenue line. We had massive deficits when we were following the Republican economic prescription for the country, which was trickle-down economics, because the outlays far exceeded revenues. The result was massive deficits and massive growth of the debt.

In 1993, we got a new administration and a new economic plan. We passed a proposal without a single vote from the other side that reduced spending as a percentage of our national economy and raised revenue. That is how we balanced the budget. That is how we stopped the raid on Social Security. That is how we stopped the economic decline the country was experiencing under their plan, under their proposal.

In fact, at the time we passed the new budget plan in 1993, which was a 5-year plan reducing the deficits each and every year as we brought spending down, we brought revenues up until the two lines crossed and we moved into surplus. Our friends on the other side of the aisle said it was a huge mistake. They said it would increase the deficit. They said it would increase unemployment. They said it would increase inflation. They were wrong on every count. They were not just a little bit wrong, they were completely wrong.

Now they come with a new economic prescription to go back to the bad old days—back to debt, back to deficits, back to decline. Are we going to take that path? Haven't we learned anything about what works? Haven't we learned the best course is one of fiscal discipline? Haven't we learned the best course is to stay on this plan that has turned massive deficits into massive surpluses, that has led to the longest

economic expansion in our country, that has led to the lowest unemployment in more than 30 years, the lowest inflation in more than 30 years? Are we going to jeopardize this with a risky tax scheme that our friends on the other side propose?

My friend from Iowa says we have the highest tax rates ever. No, we don't have the highest taxes ever. This chart shows the revenue line, and indeed it came up; that is absolutely correct. It was that combination of reduced spending and increased revenue that led to this result. However, that does not translate into higher tax rates on the American people. A key reason we have higher revenues is because we got the economy moving again. This extraordinary economic expansion—again, the longest economic expansion in our history—has generated more revenue. That is what helped balance the budget, coupled with reduced spending.

The question of what has happened to individual taxes is quite a different story. This was a story on the front page of the Washington Post: "Federal Tax Level Falls for Most. Studies Show Burden Now Less Than 10 Percent."

The story tells the truth.

For all but the wealthiest Americans, the Federal income tax burden has shrunk to the lowest level in four decades.

We don't have the highest taxes on individual American taxpayers that we have ever had, as the Senator from Iowa asserted. That is just not the case.

For all but the wealthiest Americans, the Federal income tax burden has shrunk to the lowest level in four decades.

That is the truth according to a series of studies by both liberal and conservative tax experts. Each of the studies shows the bottom line is the same. Most Americans this year will have to fork over less than 10 percent of their income to the Federal Government. The Congressional Budget Office estimates the middle fifth of American families with an average income of \$39,000 paid 5.4 percent income tax in 1999, compared with 8.3 percent in 1981. Their taxes have gone down. That is the middle-income people in America.

The Treasury Department estimates that a four-person family, with a median income of \$54,900, paid 7.46 percent of that in income tax, the lowest since 1965. And the median two-earner family making \$68,000 paid 8.8 percent in 1998, about the same as 1955.

If we are going to have a debate, let's have a debate on facts and not make up things.

The fundamental problem with the legislation offered by our colleagues: They have more of a tax cut than there is non-Social Security surplus available for a tax cut. It is a question of priorities. What do we want to do with the surpluses available? Remember, these are projected surpluses. We can take the money and use it all for a tax cut that disproportionately goes to the wealthiest. That is what the Republicans want to do.

Our side believes we ought to reserve every penny of the Social Security surplus for Social Security. Republicans agree with that. On the non-Social Security surplus, the Republicans want to use it all for a tax cut that disproportionately goes to the wealthiest; 60 percent goes to the wealthiest 10 percent.

Our side thinks the highest priority should be further paying down of the debt because that is what every economist has said is in the highest interests of this country. This is what will most assure our economic future.

Second, we believe we ought to provide for tax relief; 29 percent of the non-Social Security surplus under our proposal goes for tax relief. Part of that goes to address the marriage tax penalty. However, we are addressing those who suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Our friends on the other side want to give a big tax cut to folks who do not have the marriage tax penalty. In fact, for people receiving the marriage bonus—they pay lower taxes as a result of being married than if they were filing individually—they want to give them a tax cut, too.

When they say we are limited to 10 amendments on our side, the underlying legislation deals with many more issues than just the marriage tax penalty. They want to restrict our right to offer alternatives. That is not fair. That is not the way the Senate was designed to operate. Not surprisingly, we don't intend to go along with that. That is not the way the Senate is designed to work.

We offered legislation in the Senate Finance Committee to give people a choice. They file as married couples; they file as individuals; file the way that helps the most, that gives families the least tax liability. That is what Democrats are proposing. We do it in a way to not use all of the non-Social Security surplus for a tax cut that goes predominantly to the wealthiest. Instead, we put the highest priority on reducing the debt; the second highest priority on tax relief; the third highest priority on using money for high priority domestic needs such as defense, education, and agriculture, which are in very deep trouble.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, are the 10 minutes Senator CONRAD has remaining from the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). That is correct, from the Democratic side. There are 20 minutes remaining on the Republican side.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair. THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

MR. CONRAD. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. CONRAD pertaining to the introduction of S. 2422 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of the marriage tax relief bill. You could characterize it as tax relief or you could characterize it, I suppose, as a tax cut. But the true characterization is one that Senator HUTCHISON has over and over emphasized: This is tax correction. The bill is intended to correct the Tax Code. The code needs correction because it is an assault on the very values of our culture.

There is a fundamental unfairness when the Tax Code is at war with our values and penalizes a basic social institution such as the institution of marriage. The American people know this. They understand it is not right to have a Tax Code that penalizes marriage. The vast majority of the Members of this body understand this. This last week, during consideration of the budget resolution, the Senate voted 99-1 on the Hutchison amendment to support marriage tax relief. In other words, let's abandon the policy of punishing married people who pay higher taxes in the Tax Code.

Despite this overwhelming vote less than 10 days ago, some of my colleagues are now trying to stop or to delay the marriage tax relief measure by demanding nonrelevant amendments. Yesterday, several Senators from the other side of the aisle spoke on the floor and agreed there is unfairness in the Tax Code and that it is fundamentally unfair to tax people only because they marry. However, these same Senators then said the Finance Committee bill gives tax cuts to people who do not need them. That seems an arrogant statement to me, to suppose Government knows best how to spend the people's money. In addition, one Senator opposed the finance bill, asking, how many of these tax cuts can we afford to give away?

I submit, the real question is, how much of the hard-earned money can families afford to have taken away by an unfair system which penalizes men and women, a schoolteacher, a fireman, for getting married and beginning a family? How much longer will we continue to allow married couples to be penalized just for getting married?

We are here to correct that fundamental unfairness. It is something that has grown up in the code. It is like a weed which is taking over the garden. Good things are prevented by its presence. We ought to pull it out and make sure we have a Tax Code that does not make it harder for young people to be married and have a family.

Are we for correcting this unfairness? Are we against it? Or are we just saying that we are? One cannot say they oppose this penalty and then fight to take the relief away that is provided in the bill. Our colleagues in the House